

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated April 19, 2006. Claims 1, 9, 10, 12, 16, 22, 23, 25, 28, 29, 30, 34, 35, 36, 39, 47, 48, 50, 53, 59, 60, 62, 65, 66, 67, 71, 72, 73 and 76 to 87 are amended by this response for clarification purposes and new Claims 88 and 89 are added. No new matter is added by this response. A Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time to respond to the office action is submitted herewith. The Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any fees which are due in connection with this response.

The Office Action rejected:

- (a) Claims 1-6, 8-12, 14, 16-19, 21-26, 28-31, 33-37, 39-44, 46-51, 53-56, 58-63, 65-68, 70-74 and 76-87 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,561,904 to Locke et al. ("Locke");
- (b) Claims 7, 20, 32, 45, 57 and 69 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke; and
- (c) Claims 13, 15, 27, 38, 52, 64 and 75 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Locke in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0065126 to Miller et al. ("Miller").

Applicant respectfully disagrees with and traverses these rejections. Additionally, certain of the claims have been amended to clarify the language of the claims.

Locke discloses a gaming device having a bonus game in which a player receives a plurality of free spins. In each spin, a set of multipliers is available. Prior to a free spin, one of the multipliers is randomly selected. Col. 4, Lines 15-20. If the player receives an award from the outcome of the reels on a free spin, the award associated with the reel outcome is multiplied by the selected multiplier. Col. 4, Lines 35-40. The set of multipliers available can remain the same from free spin to free spin or can change. Col. 5, Line 60 – Col. 6, Line 13. Consequently, during the bonus game, a first outcome and a second outcome can be associated with a different set of multipliers. Col. 4, Lines 49-67.

The Office Action appears to interpret a “current outcome” in the bonus game to be a first one of the first components and a “next outcome” to be a second one of the first components. Further, the Office Action appears to interpret the “current outcome” as having a predetermined relationship (“the first relationship”) with a “current set” of hourglasses and associated multipliers and the “next outcome” as having a predetermined relationship (“the second relationship”) with the “current set” with the outermost hourglasses and multipliers removed. Further, the Office Action appears to interpret the future existence of the second relationship as causing the second relationship to exist simultaneously with the first relationship. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that the first relationship clearly ends before the second relationship begins. Therefore, the two relationships do not exist simultaneously.

Further, Locke discloses displaying the different sets of hourglasses and associated multipliers on different spins. It is respectfully submitted that Locke does not disclose or suggest that the relationship between the “current outcome” and the “current set” of hourglasses and associated multipliers is displayed simultaneously with the relationship between the “next outcome” and the “current set” with the outermost hourglasses and multipliers removed. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Locke does not disclose or suggest a display device that simultaneously displays a predetermined relationship of a first one of the first components and a second one of the first components with different sets of second components.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Locke combined with Miller does not render obvious a display device that simultaneously displays a predetermined relationship of a first one of the first components and a second one of the first components with different sets of second components.

For at least these reasons, it is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 1 and Claims 2-15 and 76-77, which depend from Claim 1, are each patentably distinguished over Locke and are in condition for allowance.

For similar reasons, Claim 16, 28, 39, 53 and 65 and Claims 17-27 and 78-79, which depend from Claim 16, Claims 29-38 and 80-81, which depend from Claim 28, Claims 40-52 and 82-83, which depend from Claim 39, Claim 54-64 and 84-85, which depend from Claim 53, and Claims 66-75 and 86-87, which depend from Claim 65, are each patentably distinguished over Locke and are in condition for allowance.

For similar reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1 16, 28, 39, 53 and 65 and Claims 2-15 and 76-77, which depend from Claim 1, Claims 17-27 and 78-79, which depend from Claim 16, Claims 29-38 and 80-81, which depend from Claim 28, Claims 40-52 and 82-83, which depend from Claim 39, Claim 54-64 and 84-85, which depend from Claim 53, and Claims 66-75 and 86-87, which depend from Claim 65, are each patentably distinguished over Locke in view of Miller and are in condition for allowance.

Further, applicant respectfully submits that the “current outcome” and the “next outcome” are not both eligible for generation at the same time and that the set of hourglasses and multipliers associated with the “next outcome” does not include any element that is not also in the “current set.”

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Locke does not disclose or suggest a plurality of first components, a plurality of sets of second components and an award adapted to be provided to the player as in Claim 88.

Further, it is respectfully submitted that Locke combined with Miller does not render obvious a plurality of first components, a plurality of sets of second components and an award adapted to be provided to the player as in Claim 88.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 88 and 89 are each patentably distinguished over Locke and are in condition for allowance.

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY



Adam H. Masia
Reg. No. 35,602
Cust. No. 29159

Dated: August 18, 2006